COURTSHIP OF WALES.

The Prince's First Glimpse of His Wife.

Since everybody is talking about the baccarat scandal involving the Prince of Wales, this account of how the Prince came to fall in love with his wife is in order. Albert Edward chanced to be whiling away part of a long summer afternoon with two or three congenial spirits, young men of rank and position near enough to his own to make even discussions on domestic questions possible, and the matrimonial outlook for one of the party was brought up. Colonel —— drew from his pocket the photograph, as he supposed, of his fiancee, to show it proudly to his companions.

But instead of Lady ——'s likeness there appeared a rather poorly taken carte de visite of the most charming girl the Prince's eyes had ever rested upon—a girl wearing a simple little white gown and loose white jacket, with a black velvet ribbon circling her throat, and her hair smoothed back from her brow, leaving the beautiful young face to be admired for itself alone.

The eyes and lips seemed to be smiling at the Prince, who gazed at the picture, demanding to know who in the world this lovely "country girl" might be. "The daughter of the Prince of Denmark," was the answer, and, naturally enough, the carte de visite changed owners. From that moment Albert Edward was in love with the lady who soon became his wife.

When the ship bearing the Princess to London drew near Gravesend sixty young ladies, attired in the red and white colors of Denmark, assembled at the wharves to strew flowers beneath the feet of the Prince's bride. The moment the yacht came in view bearing its precious freight the air was rent with cheers, at which, so relates a lady in the party, Alexandra turned pale with excitement and clung to her mother, hardly knowing what to do or say in answer to the wild tumult of the people.

Those upon the shore saw a pretty sight—a timid, girlish figure, dressed entirely in white, who appeared on the deck at her mother's side; then, returning to the cabin, was seen first at one window, then at another, the bewitching face framed in a little white bonnet, the work of her own hands.

The Prince's yacht approached that of his bride, the gangway was thrown down, and immediately he was seen by all those thousands to rush across it, and waiting for no formal words of greeting, and to the delight of the onlookers, caught the Princess in his arms and kissed her, "just," as an honest Yorkshire man said to me in describing the scene, "as though she were any other lass."

TIRED OF WAITING.

John Taylor, a Toronto Nonagenarian, Commits Suicide.

John Taylor, of East Toronto, an old gentleman 90 years of age, a native of Scotland and well known throughout the Township of York, disappeared from the residence of John Keith, where he had been staying, on Sunday week. Strict search was instituted for him, but without avail until Monday at 6 p. m., when Constable Tidsbury, of East Toronto Village, discovered the body lying in what is known as Hearn's bush, about two miles from the village. The poor old man had evidently been dead for over a week. Beside the body was found a bottle capable of holding three ounces of laudanum, in which perhaps a fifth of the quantity remained. It bore the label of Hugh Miller & Co., King street, Toronto. In one of the pockets was found a letter written in a tremulous hand upon a sheet of note paper. The letter was written in ink, but so irregular in form as to raise the belief that it had been penned in the dark. It read as follows:

John Taylor is my name. I leave this world for ever. If any person find me bury me as I am. I don't want a chest nor coffin. Bury me as I am. It is laudanum that is the cure. John Keith has been very kind to me. Don't tell John Taylor nothing about me. He does not like to be bothered. Farewell.

Laudanum had indeed been the cure. The dose taken must have produced death very quickly. The clerks at Miller's drug store do not remember selling the laudanum, saying that such a large dose is only sold for horse medicine. The remains were taken to Little York and Coroner Britton notified. After inquiry he came to the conclusion that the case was one of suicide and decided not to hold an inquest. The funeral will take place this afternoon at 5 o'clock.

John Taylor, the man alluded to in the note, is the grandson of the old man and there seems to be little ground for his grandfather's last words. He wished the old gentleman to live with him but he refused, saying he would rather live with Mr. Keith, an old friend. The grandson and the other members of the family—well-known citizens of Toronto—sought to deter him from this but he wished to go and at last it was decided to pay his board wherever he might wish to live. The trouble over this matter seems to have caused the melancholy resolve on the part of Mr. Taylor to end all his troubles. His relatives have the sympathy of the community.

TRIAL IN A BEDROOM.

A Murderer Case by the Sick-bed of the Principal Witness.

A New York despatch says: A dramatic incident occurred Saturday when Henry C. Fanning, the murderer of Mrs. Emily Taylor, was taken to the bedside of Mrs. McCarthy, a friend of the murdered woman, while two assistant district attorneys took the invalid woman's statement. This step was necessary, as Mrs. McCarthy could not be taken to the court, and the law requires the presence of the accused at the examination of all witnesses. When Fanning was brought into the sick chamber Mrs. McCarthy fainted. After a time she recovered sufficiently to tell her story. She said Mrs. Taylor had often told her that she feared Fanning more than the devil. Mrs. Taylor had lived with witness many months. A few weeks before she was murdered Mrs. Taylor returned home with several wounds on her head made by Fanning, who had attempted to brain her with a scone. At the time they were in Central Park, and if it had not been for her quickness in escaping Fanning would have accomplished his purpose. On the night that Mrs. Taylor was murdered she kissed Mrs. McCarthy as she was leaving the house to meet Fanning, saying she might never see her again. Three days later Mrs. McCarthy identified the body at the morgue. This testimony will be read to the jury on Monday.

Mark Was a Patriot.

One of the best fellows in the Elora Company, in 1866, was Mark Patterson recently of Hamilton and Toronto. He was gritty, attentive to duties, fond of his work and every inch a soldier. His company was ordered for active service on the 2nd of April that year, and Mark, carrying out previous arrangements, got married that day. Here was a pretty state of things. He wanted to go to the front, of course, although his wife said "don't." But he did. He knew that the greater contained the less, that in his country was his home, and that in defending the one he insured the safety of the other. So, although he was married on the 2nd, he started for Chatham on the 3rd. That was all. He returned to Elora on the 23rd May, and on the 2nd June went off once more to meet the Fenians. For five other long weeks his wife had to do the chores without him. Mark grunned, but bore his troubles like a man. And yet, at the last election, there were men in Hamilton who styled him a rebel with a big D!—*Elora Correspondence Guelph Mercury.*

Arthur U. Sayles, a letter-opener in the Dead Letter Bureau of the Post-office Department at Washington, was arrested yesterday for stealing money from letters. He had eight letters in his possession, two of which were test letters used by the post-office inspectors and containing marked money. Sayles confessed.

The mules in Ingle's coal mines, near Evansville, Ind., were hoisted out recently. Some of them had not seen daylight for eight years. The smallest thing frightened them, a flying bird causing them to jump, while upon seeing a dog they would stand and tremble with terror.

Notice of revision of the Dominion voters' lists for Winnipeg has been given.

—First actress—What is the name of your getting a divorce? You are popular with your audiences. Second actress—Yes; but I intend to quit the stage and enter society.

—Young man—I have a poem here. Editor, after examining it—Well, how does one dollar strike you? Young man—That's really more than I expected. Editor—Well, we can't publish such a poem as that for less than ten.

About 450 B. C. the Ionians first introduced the present system of writing from left to right; previous to the above date from right to left prevailed.

A FIERCE SEA FIGHT.

A Chilian Rebel Cruiser Engages Three Government Gunboats.

UNDER THE GUNS OF THE FORTS.

A San Francisco despatch says: News of the fiercest sea fight that has taken place during the whole of the Chilian war has just been received here. It took place in the harbor of Valparaiso on April 26th, between the insurgent cruiser Magillanes and the Government torpedo boats Alden, Condell and Lynch, four days after the encounter between the same vessels off Channel Bay, the news of which was received in New York on Monday last. After the latter battle the Magillanes decided to attack the Government ships, and, if possible, destroy them before they could again be fitted for sea. Favored by darkness, the Magillanes crept into the harbor of Valparaiso and began the attack by ranging close alongside the already crippled Alden and firing a broadside into her that did terrible execution. Nearly half of the torpedo boat's crew were either killed or wounded, and the vessel was completely riddled. An alarm was sounded in the forts, but as the vessels lay so close together the gunners in the forts dared not fire, for fear of hitting their own vessels. Getting clear of the Alden, the Magillanes at once attacked the Lynch, but her fire was returned with interest. The smokestack of the Lynch was blown away, and a boat containing ten men, who had been sent to try to attack the rebel vessel with a torpedo boat, was blown out of the water. The Condell, which had steamed to the outside of the Magillanes, was shot through and through. Over forty of her crew were lying dead or dying on her decks, but her guns were untouched, and her captain made up his mind to try to better his position. Suddenly the rebel vessel began to move astern and cease firing. The night being dark, the Government steamers were unknowingly firing into each other, and the Condell began to fill rapidly. The trick was not discovered until the Magillanes had turned, and steaming across the stern of the Condell, poured in a broadside that nearly demolished the latter, dismantling her guns, and killing fourteen and wounding six more of her crew. The rebel steamer then started to steam out of the harbor at full speed. Every gun in the forts on shore opened on her, but only once was she struck. A heavy shell landed fairly on her deck, just forward of her pivot gun, and burst. The explosion tore a big hole in her deck, the pivot gun was thrown over on its side, and four men killed. Soon after that she was out of range of the forts, and ran up the coast to Caldera. Over one hundred men were killed during the fierce conflict, fully one-half of whom were on board the Magillanes. No attempt was made by the foreign warships to stop the fight, which lasted fully an hour. The Condell had to be run upon the beach to prevent her sinking, while the Alden was so badly damaged that it will take a long time to repair her. In addition to the loss of half of her crew, the Lynch lost four out of her six officers, including her commander.

PHILIP IS IN DEMAND.

Two Women Claim to Call a Torontonian Husband.

A Buffalo despatch says: Two wives are making life very unpleasant for Philip Rouche, who lived at East Buffalo until three weeks ago. Rouch came to this city from Canada two years ago. He was good-looking, dressed fashionably, and had no difficulty in getting a charming girl of East Buffalo to fall in love with him. A brief courtship was ended by marriage. They settled down and seemed to be leading a happy life. A month ago, however, Mrs. Rouch was horrified to learn that her husband had another wife living, whom he married in Toronto several years ago. She set about quietly investigating, and found that Rouch wedded Sarah Bonner in Toronto ten years ago. He deserted her after living with her seven years, and came to this city, where he met she woman who is his second wife. He secured no divorce from his first wife. When confronted with his second wife he pleaded innocence. Two days later he skipped from Buffalo and has not been seen since. The grand jury indicted him for bigamy at their last session, but as he could not be found the indictment was kept secret. Mrs. Rouch No. 2 has begun an action in the Supreme Court, through her lawyer, Edward T. Durand, to set aside the marriage, on the ground that it is void owing to Rouch having another wife living. A referee was appointed to hear and decide the case.

MURDER AT CORNWALL.

An Italian Plunges a Knife into a Comrade Fatally Wounding Him.

A Cornwall despatch says; A row which in all probability will result in the death of an Italian named Peter Garro, aged 17, occurred in a house on York street about two o'clock to-day. As nearly as can be ascertained a number of Italians were loafing in front of the house when one of their number, John Faro, became annoyed and left the crowd, returning with a large knife and called Garro out. When Garro approached, Faro immediately rushed at him and made a plunge for his breast. The young man threw the blow to one side, but the enraged scoundrel made another dash at him, driving the knife full length into his bowels directly under the liver. The victim instantly fell to the ground and the slayer made off. When your correspondent reached the house Garro was lying back on a chair with blood streaming from the wound. Doctors were immediately summoned, and in a short time Dr. Alguire appeared on the scene and said the man was dying. Shortly afterwards Drs. Hamilton and Gravelly arrived. The man was placed on a mattress on the floor, and as he was suffering intensely morphine was administered and the victim made as comfortable as possible. At 5 o'clock Police Magistrate Bethune and County Crown Attorney Dingwall took the dying man's deposition.

A JEALOUS HUSBAND

Adopts a Fiendish Method of Extorting Damaging Admissions.

A Sedalia, Mo., despatch says: George Burnham, a young railroad man, suspected his wife of infidelity. He accused her of this, but she denied it emphatically. Angered by her denial he bound and gagged her, seated her in a chair. He one match after another, and scorched her flesh until, in an agony of pain, she signified that she would confess. She was loosed, and then told her husband the story of her misdoings, naming a number of men with whom she acknowledged having been intimate. When she had finished, Burnham, instead of swearing vengeance on the heads of the men, decided that his wife and he should leave town, which they did on Saturday. Burnham will leave his wife with her parents in Illinois.

The Chaplain Gives Back the Cards.

"I had rather a remarkable experience while I was chaplain in the army," remarked one of the ministers at the pastors' union.

"What was it?"

"I had been working and talking to the boys about gambling, and they finally turned all the cards in the camp over to me. The next day they were paid off. The following day I was passing out and saw a blanket spread out with two lumps of sugar on one corner, and about half the money in the camp spread out."

"What were they doing?"

"They were betting on which lump of sugar a fly would first light, and all the money on the blanket changed hands on the result."

"What did you say to the boys?"

"I said, 'Here, boys, come get your cards.'"—*Columbus (O.) Dispatch.*

Gas Smoke at Work.

The California State Board of Arbitration has given a decision that masons and stonecutters can smoke while at work. The question was one of asthmatics. By granting eight hours the bosses lost money. They asked the union to save as much of the loss as possible by not wasting time by smoking. When the order against smoking was issued the men struck, and hence the interference of the Board of Arbitration. The board evidently believed that "meat and mass," and smoking, "never hindered work."

The Russian Crown Prince, who is just twenty-two years old, is a highly educated young man. He is particularly well up in science, and possesses an admirable knowledge of the geography of his native land.

"When I see all those Italians coming into this country," said Wilkins, "I am impressed with one thing." "What is that?" asked Hawkes. "That Italy must be getting to be quite a desirable place to live in."

WALES IN COURT.

Ready to Give Evidence in the Baccarat Scandal Case.

THE LEGAL TALENT ENGAGED.

Sir Edward Clark's Defence of Sir William Gordon Cumming.

The Prince of Wales Listens to the Evidence.

A last (Monday) night's London cable gives the later proceedings in the famous baccarat case as follows:

Long before the hour (11 a. m.) fixed for the hearing of this case, the court-room was filled with crowds of fashionable people. The first tremor of excitement was caused by the arrival, in the court-room, of Sir William Gordon Cumming, the plaintiff, accompanied by his counsel, Solicitor-General Clark and Mr. Gill. Opposed to these legal lights are Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Asquith, Q. C., and Arthur Russell, who arrived promptly and almost at the same time as Sir William Gordon Cumming, accompanied by the defendants.

Sir William Gordon Cumming was called to the witness box and questioned by his counsel. The baronet detailed his career and proceeded to give his version of the Tranby Croft affair. The plaintiff said the Prince of Wales acted as banker on the occasions referred to and that Gen. Williams was the croupier. His (plaintiff's) attention was not called on the first night, Sept. 8th, to the complaint made against him. On the following evening, when dressing for dinner, Lord Coventry and General Williams came to him in his bed room at Tranby Croft and the former said, "Cumming, something very disagreeable has occurred. Some people staying here have objected to your manner of playing baccarat." To this Sir William Cumming replied, "My God, what do you mean?" Lord Coventry, the plaintiff said, then repeated his former remark, adding that people said he (Cumming) had, while playing baccarat the previous evening, resorted to foul play. The plaintiff said he then replied that this was a foul, abominable charge and a deliberate falsehood, adding, addressing Lord Coventry and General Williams, "What am I to do? You two are my old friends. For goodness' sake what is to be done?" Plaintiff then remarked that he added to this request that he placed the whole matter entirely in their hands, and that after dinner, at the suggestion of Lord Coventry and Gen. Williams, he, the plaintiff, had an interview with the Prince of Wales, to whom he repudiated the charge and said: "Your Royal Highness will see what a terrible thing this is for me. I, who have been attempting for twenty years to lead the life of an officer and gentleman." To this, according to the plaintiff, the Prince of Wales replied: "What can you do? There are five accusers." Sir Wm. Cumming said: "My first impulse is to publicly insult my accusers upon the racecourse to-morrow." To this the Prince replied: "What is the use of that? There are five people against you." Lord Coventry and Gen. Williams told the plaintiff the only way to avoid "a horrible scandal" was to sign the document which had already been produced and read in court by Sir Edward Clark. The plaintiff added: "I said, why, this is tantamount to an admission of guilt; but I was eventually persuaded to sign the document by Gen. Williams and Lord Coventry, whom I regarded as being true and intimate friends." Sir William further testified that on the second night of the baccarat games at Tranby Croft (September 9th) the Prince of Wales was banker, and that Arthur Stanley Wilson won five "coups" running, which Cumming thought was very good "for a novice." At the end of the game, the plaintiff continued, "the Prince of Wales laughingly said: 'Cumming, how came you to win so much?' referring to the fact that I had won £225 in two nights' play. To this I replied: 'Well, sir, I could not help winning with such luck,' showing the Prince a card on which I had kept marked, under the headings of 'Banker' and 'Player,' the exact number of times which the banker or player had won during the evening's play." The plaintiff answered Sir Edward Clark's questions in a clear voice, which could be heard all over the court-room, and kept his back turned toward the Prince of Wales, a fact which was considerably commented upon unfavorably by the audience. While giving his testimony Sir William leaned on the edge of the witness-box, calmly surveying the court and its occupants, and occasionally nodding slightly to an acquaintance recognized among the people present. The baronet concluded his testimony with a solemn and impressive denial that he ever cheated at cards at Tranby Croft or anywhere else.

THE CROSS-EXAMINATION.

The cross-examination of the plaintiff was commenced by Sir Charles Russell. The plaintiff said he had no reason to suspect malice upon the part of any of the defendants. Sir Charles then carelessly glanced at a paper, and, turning toward the plaintiff, who had evidently nerved himself to face Sir Charles' fire, continued, "and does this express your opinion (reading): 'The worst of it is that I feel that they are acting perfectly conscientiously in the matter, and believe that they did not resort to foul play.'

"Pardon me," cried Sir William, quickly drawing himself up, his eyes sparkling and his whole manner denoting considerable excitement, "Are you reading from any letter of mine?"

Sir Charles Russell replied: "Yes. Does it express your feelings?"

"Yes," replied the plaintiff sharply.

Then Sir William, under cross-examination, explained at length several points in regard to baccarat playing.

The baronet admitted that within 24 hours after signing this document he received a letter from Lord Coventry and General William saying there was no possibility of doing otherwise than to believe him guilty, so there were five people against one. He, Sir William Gordon Cumming, signed the document because his friends advised him he had no chance to prove his innocence, as there were five against him, and in order to avoid a scandal which would necessarily involve the Prince of Wales. The plaintiff added that had General Williams and Lord Coventry given him any indication that they had a belief in his guilt, he would not have signed the document presented to him.

Sir Charles Russell read a letter which Sir William Gordon Cumming had handed to General Williams before leaving Tranby Croft, in which the baronet said he hoped General Williams would tell the Prince of Wales that he (Sir William) had been entirely guided by the advice given him by the Prince, Lord Coventry and Gen. Williams, although he denied the allegations made against him, as it was essential to avoid a scandal. In this letter Sir William also said he would never touch another card, and expressed the wish that his winnings should be given to some hospital. In answering a question put to him by Sir Chas. Russell, the plaintiff said he had received a memorandum, signed by the Prince of Wales and by Lord Coventry and Gen. Williams, saying that the signers of the memorandum did not wish to be heard, but he (Sir William) must clearly understand that, in the face of the overwhelming evidence presented, it was useless to attempt to deny the accusation against him, and that, as long as he complied with the conditions set forth in the document he (the plaintiff) had signed, silence would be maintained.

The court soon after adjourned until to-morrow. The Prince of Wales was present throughout the proceedings, and seemed to take considerable interest in the testimony given by the plaintiff.

A last (Tuesday) night's London cable gives the following report of the Prince of Wales' evidence in the baccarat case: The Prince of Wales recited how the event had resulted in the breaking up of the party at Tranby Croft. Before leaving Mrs. Wilson's residence witness had sent to his private secretary, Sir Francis Knollys, for safe-keeping, a statement in connection with the case, which was signed by three of the gentlemen and one of the ladies who were present at the playing of the disputed game of baccarat. Sir Francis was unaware of the nature of the statement intrusted to his care, and had not seen the plaintiff, Sir William, until that gentleman had been interviewed by General Williams and Lord Coventry, and had denied the truth of the charge to him (witness). When the witness heard the story of Sir William's alleged wrong doing, General Williams and Lord Coventry prepared for and handed to him a statement of the occurrence. This concluded the evidence of the Prince on the direct examination.

THE CROSS EXAMINATION.

Sir Charles Russell then questioned the Prince on behalf of the defence. In reply to questions by Sir Charles the Prince testified that he believed he had also seen in this connection Prince Edward and Capt. Somerset, in addition to the three gentlemen to whom certain statements had been made by three other gentlemen of the party. Witness was not informed that two ladies, whom he had not seen at the time, alleged that they also had witnessed dishonest play by the plaintiff. He did not recall whether any one of the three gentlemen said anything about withdrawing a portion of the stakes, or that Sir William surreptitiously placed on the board a larger stake than had originally been placed there. Continuing, the Prince stated that the memorandum of the unfortunate affair which had been prepared and submitted to Sir William for his signature did not come from him. It was simply a proposition made by Lord Coventry in which witness acquiesced. Witness was greatly distressed by the occurrence. Referring to the interview had by him with Sir William in presence of General Williams, witness said that the plaintiff asked him whether he believed the statements made against him, and which involved his honor. Witness did not, however, recollect what had been his reply to the question. Witness was quite certain that during the conversation the plaintiff had intimated his willingness to have the matter of his conduct referred to the Duke of Cambridge; also remembered that in reply to his suggestion General Williams intimated that he did not think the Duke of Cambridge would look upon the affair as leniently as we did. The Prince, continuing his statement, which was not interrupted, declared that he had, out of regard for Sir William, desired to act as leniently as was possible under the circumstances. The date of the document submitted to Sir William was omitted at the time of writing, and had been affixed on the same night after the plaintiff had attached his signature to the paper. Here witness was asked how recently he had been in the company of plaintiff. His reply, which was, "I have not met Sir William since the unfortunate occurrence here under investigation. I should consider it more agreeable not to meet him in the future," was delivered with somewhat of an emphasis and created a sensation.

QUESTIONS OF A JUROR.

When Sir Charles Russell had concluded his examination, and after Sir Edward Clark, on behalf of the prosecution, had in courtly grace assured the Prince that he would not be detained one moment longer than was absolutely necessary, there came the only really exciting scene of the day.

Hardly had the Solicitor-General finished his depository sentence, when a juryman, after unexpectedly indicating his desire that the witness should not leave the box, proceeded calmly and deliberately to examine him, as follows:

Juror—Are the members of this jury to understand that you were acting as banker on those two occasions and yet saw nothing of the alleged malpractices?

Prince of Wales—It is not a very easy matter for the banker when dealing to see anything of that kind. Especially is this true when the game is being played in the country houses of friends, where one would not for a moment suspect any person present of unfair play.

Back at the heir-apparent came the persistent juror with another question, to which the Prince replied that when the charges against the plaintiff were made with so much unanimity he considered he had no other alternative than to believe in their truth.

When the determined juror signified that he was through with the Prince, Sir Edward Clark asked a question in redirect examination which drew from the witness an emphatic repetition of his original statement that he had not himself seen any unfair play at Tranby Croft. Witness was then allowed to leave the box. His testimony had been given in a halting, hesitating way, and although he had been but twenty minutes in the witness-box it was plainly apparent to every one present that the Prince was glad the ordeal was over. While in the box he had been uneasy, had frequently and restlessly changed his position. Not once did he lift his eyes or look upon the eager faces everywhere sharing at him. His face was flushed, and an occasional nervous tremor shook his frame. But very few of his auditors were audible to others than those in close proximity to the witness-box. With the testimony to-day the plaintiff's case was closed, and the court adjourned until to-morrow.

A last Wednesday night's London cable says: The baccarat trial was continued to day before the Queen's Bench Division of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice. There was the usual large attendance of fashionable people. The Prince of Wales had not arrived up to the moment Lord Coleridge took his seat, and the general opinion seemed to be that the heir-apparent, disgusted with his experience of yesterday, would find some excuse which would enable him to escape any further attendance in court. To the astonishment of almost everybody present, the Lord Chief Justice had hardly settled himself comfortably in the cushions of his chair and had just omitted the solemn "hem," preliminary to saying something, when Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, accompanied by his faithful Private Secretary, Sir Francis Knolly, entered the court, in better condition it would seem than upon the occasion of his two previous visits, bowing and smiling to the audience assembled, who respectfully rose to their feet and the jovial heir-apparent appeared.

Sir Richard Russell, leading counsel for the defendants slowly rose from his seat, bowed to the Lord Chief Justice, to the members of the bar and to the ladies, and commenced his address on behalf of his clients. Sir Charles said his clients had been, much against their wishes, compelled to take the course they had adopted. There were nine persons concerned in this "melancholy business," continued Sir Charles, all of whom have known the plaintiff, Sir William Gordon Cumming, for many years. The plaintiff admitted, he said, that his accusers were acting conscientiously in this matter, and the jury would find it impossible to believe that those persons were mistaken in regard to the character of the plaintiff's conduct on the nights of the 8th and 9th of September, 1890. The plaintiff had admitted that they were all persons of honor and honesty, and having made the charges they adhered to them, and the plaintiff had not acted to be confronted with either of his accusers. The objection to secrecy came from Lycett Green, who asked that the matter be "threshed out there and then." The plaintiff, continued Sir Charles Russell, had signed a degrading, humiliating document, and he did not take steps to bring his slanderers to justice. Then he turned upon those who had been quite prepared to keep their agreement, though he, in their eyes, was a dishonored man. And now, how about the three principal actors and the plaintiff's action in regard to them? Do you, gentlemen of the jury, doubt that the plaintiff knew that each of those gentlemen believed him guilty? He knew that in their eyes he was no longer in the category of honorable men. Was it conceivable that an innocent man under such circumstances should bear such an odious burden on him? In describing the events which took place in Mrs. Arthur Wilson's parlors at Tranby Croft, Sir Charles Russell said Arthur Stanley Wilson had witnessed repeated acts of cheating upon the part of Cumming, and that when Wilson turned to Berkeley Levett and whispered, "Cumming is cheating," Levett replied, "Nonsense, you are mad." But, added Sir Charles, Berkeley Levett, after receiving this communication, paid more attention to the game, watched Cumming's play, and saw for himself that which Wilson had said was true. After the play was over Wilson told his mother, Mrs. Arthur Wilson, and Mr. and Mrs. Lycett Green, of what he had seen while Cumming was playing, and they agreed on the following night to have for baccarat playing a properly marked table with a line upon it, beyond which the player's stake must not be placed.

FOR THE DEFENCE.

Arthur Stanley Wilson, son of the millionaire owner of Tranby Croft, and the leading stockholder in the Wilson line of steamers, entered the witness box as the first witness for the defence. Mr. Wilson testified to the fact that on the first night of the baccarat playing at Tranby Croft, September 8th, he saw a red counter, representing £5, in front of Cumming. When the latter's tableau won, Sir William had his hand in front of him, and he also had another £5 counter in the palm of his right hand. The Baronet, according to witness, then looked at Sir Edward Somerset's hand, and seeing that he held a natural and a court card, he (Sir William) at once dropped the £5 counter from his right hand and was paid on both of the counters he had thus placed on the table. This evidence caused a great sensation. Mr. Wilson said he saw the same thing repeated by Cumming the same evening, and he then told Levett that the Baronet was cheating. When Mr. Wilson informed Levett of what he had observed, Levett said it was "impossible," that the witness must be mistaken. Wilson told Levett to watch Sir William. Levett followed his advice, and he also saw the Baronet cheat in the manner described. Levett, upon being convinced by personal observation that what Wilson said was true, exclaimed, "This is too hot." Witness was indignant when asked if he was not a novice in the game of baccarat. Wilson replied that he had played the game often before the notorious games at Tranby Croft, and claimed to thoroughly understand the game in all its details. Continuing, Wilson said he saw Cumming cheat again. The Baronet had a £5 counter on the table, and directly he discovered that the card turned up was favorable to him he pushed a £2 counter forward with a pencil which he held in his hand, and was paid £7. The witness then detailed the subsequent conversation he had with Levett in the latter's bed-room, saying that when he told the latter of what he had seen, Levett exclaimed, "My God! to think of Lieut.-Col. Sir William Gordon Cumming being caught cheating at cards!" The witness said, "I asked what on earth are we to do?" To this Levett replied: "For goodness' sake don't ask me. He is in my own regiment and was my own captain. What am I to do?" Wilson said, "I then told my mother what I had seen, and my mother said, 'For goodness' sake don't have a scandal here.' I then told her I would have a proper table prepared for baccarat playing, so that a repetition of the conduct we had observed would be impossible." Replying to a question on the subject, young Wilson said there was absolutely no agreement to watch Cumming play on the second night. The table used for baccarat on that occasion was a long pantry table covered with green baize. As upon the previous night the Prince of Wales occupied the position of banker, and Gen. Williams acted as croupier. The witness believed the plaintiff again had a paper and some of his counters on the table. He had other counters in the breast pocket of his dress coat. The plaintiff, added the witness, had a long thick carpenter's pencil in his hand. On this pencil the words "Tranby Croft" were stamped. Cumming staked a £5 counter, and the Prince of Wales gave cards to Lady Coventry, who took a seven, which was considered a good card, from that pack. The plaintiff looked over Lady Coventry's hand, and the witness then saw Sir William's hand go out and gradually advance the white line marked on the baccarat table. It then came round to the Prince of Wales' turn to take a card, and he took one and said, "I go bankrupt," the card being bad. Immediately upon hearing this Cumming pushed over the line a tenpound counter. The plaintiff's tableau won, and the Prince of Wales paid him a fiver (five-pound note), overlooking the other counter which the plaintiff had pushed over the line. Thereupon Cumming exclaimed, "Beg pardon, sir, there is another tenner here which you have forgotten." The Prince of Wales, saying, "I wish you would put your stakes forward more conspicuously," paid the additional ten pounds. "Later in the game," said the witness, "Cumming flicked another counter over the line with his pencil. When the disclosures were made the Prince of Wales questioned Cumming, Levett, and Lycett Green in regard to what they had seen of a wrong nature during the baccarat playing, and Green asked to be confronted with the plaintiff."

During his cross-examination Wilson said baccarat was played at Tranby Croft in 1889. "But father objected to it, and it was not played there again until upon the occasion of the Prince of Wales' visit in September, 1890."

The cross-examination did not result in picking any material flaws in Wilson's story.

Wilson's cross-examination was not finished when the court adjourned till to-morrow.

A last (Thursday) night's London cable says: The interest taken on this the fourth day of the Tranby Croft baccarat scandal trial was apparently as great as that manifested upon the three previous days.

Arthur Stanley Wilson, whose demeanor yesterday made him a sort of hero in the drama of society, was the first witness this morning. Mr. Wilson's cross-examination was continued with a long and very interesting discussion as to the position of the tables used in playing baccarat at Tranby Croft. Replying to the questions of Sir Edward Clark, the leading counsel for the plaintiff, Mr. Wilson said, "When I gave the orders to change the tables after the disclosures of the first night's play, I was ready to stake my life that Sir William Gordon Cumming cheated. My mother and I sat down to play on the second night, September 9th, believing that the chalk line which we had marked on the table would prevent any further attempt at cheating."

"And not a word was said to the plaintiff?" asked Sir Edward Clark, in apparent surprise.

"Certainly not," replied Mr. Wilson, sharply; "what was my word against that of Sir William Gordon Cumming?" Continuing, the witness said: "On the second night I first noticed there was something wrong with Sir William Gordon Cumming twenty minutes after the beginning of the play. Lady Coventry was sitting between the plaintiff and Gen. Owen Williams. I sat around the corner. The plaintiff did not put his hands over the line until he knew his own side had won, and then he put over a £10 counter, making the stake £15 instead of £5."

"Then," asked Sir Edward Clark, "why did you not say to Sir William Gordon Cumming, 'You only staked £5?'"

Mr. Wilson replied: "Because there were ladies present, and it would have been an ungentlemanly thing to have had a row before them."

"And," continued the Solicitor-General, "you went on staking your money after seeing the plaintiff cheat?"

"Yes," replied Wilson, coolly.

LIEUT. LEVETT EXAMINED.

Berkely T. J. Levett, a lieutenant in the Scots Guards, a regiment of which Sir William Gordon Cumming was major and lieutenant-colonel and one of the defendants in the suit brought by the latter, was the next witness.

Lieut. Levett appeared to be very pale and nervous, evidently dreading the ordeal through which he expected to pass. Replying to Sir Charles Russell's questions, the witness said he was a lieutenant, and that he had known Sir William Gordon Cumming intimately since 1886. The lieutenant in substance then confirmed Mr. Wilson's testimony in regard to what took place at Tranby Croft on September 8th, 9th and 10th. He said on the first night Arthur Wilson told him of Sir William Gordon Cumming's strange actions while playing baccarat, and then told him to look for himself and become convinced that the baronet was cheating. He did as requested, and saw the plaintiff on the second or third coup handle his counters as already detailed, and when the banker declared a coup, Sir William Gordon Cumming added two more £5 counters and was afterwards paid £15 for them. Subsequently, after three more coups, witness again saw Sir William add another £5 counter after the banker had declared the cards. It was then that witness had turned to Stanley Wilson and said, "It's too hot." There had been, the witness declared, no agreement to watch Sir William's play on the second night. The witness, on the contrary, had purposely avoided watching on that occasion. Witness then testified that he was present at the interview in which Mr. Lycett Green made the statement to the Prince of Wales of what had been discovered. On that occasion the Prince, turning to the witness, said: "I believe you, too, saw it." To this remark witness had replied: "Well, I am in an awkward position. We are in the same regiment, and he (Sir William) is my captain." Witness had faithfully kept the compact of secrecy. When the plaintiff had called witness, "Could not you say you were mistaken?" the latter replied, "I could for your sake and for the sake of the regiment, but Lycett Green won't. I saw you adding counters."

MR. LYCETT GREEN EXAMINED.

Mr. Lycett Green, son-in-law of Mrs. Wilson, was sworn. This witness confirmed the testimony given by Mr. Wilson, so far as it referred to his part in the matter at issue.

While this witness was giving his testimony the foreman of the special jury handed up to Lord Chief Justice Coleridge a letter which had been sent to a juryman and which was couched in threatening and abusive language.

Mr. Lycett Green then turned toward the Chief Justice and said: "Your Lordship, I have also received a letter of the same description as that which has just been handed up to you by the jury."

Resuming his testimony, the witness graphically described the events of the second night's play at Tranby Croft, when he had distinctly seen the plaintiff push counters over the line, when he (plaintiff) saw that the card had been favorably declared. It had been the first impulse of the witness to there and then expose the foul play of Sir William. He had only desisted from so doing because of the presence of the Prince of Wales and the ladies. He, however, rose from the table and left the room. After withdrawing from the party witness had sent a note in to Mrs. Arthur Wilson, reading as follows: "I have seen Sir William Gordon Cumming cheating and cannot remain in the room longer. Something ought to be done to stop the game." Later the witness had asked to be confronted with the plaintiff if the latter denied his guilt.

MRS. LYCETT GREEN EXAMINED.

Mrs. Lycett Green, wife of the previous witness and daughter of Arthur Wilson sen., was the next witness. Mrs. Green said that in 1888 Sir William Cumming dined at her house and there taught her to play baccarat. Mrs. Green explained that she had previously met the plaintiff at the house of her mother, and she had intimately known a relative of Sir William Cumming, for which relative she still had a great regard. Mrs. Green then described the position of the baccarat players during the games played at Tranby Croft in September last, and said she heard the Prince of Wales several times tell plaintiff to put his stakes where they could be seen. Upon one of these occasions Cumming replied, "It is on the paper in front of me." Mrs. Green said she noticed plaintiff on the night in question was "in luck, and nothing more." Witness then gave an account of the event during the second night of the baccarat playing, after she had been informed Cumming had been cheating. Mrs. Green's testimony in this respect agreed in every essential detail with that given by the previous witnesses on behalf of the defendant. Mrs. Green positively declared that she had not mentioned the unpleasant baccarat incident to anybody but her husband until legal action was brought against herself and the other defendants by Cumming.

Witness replied very positively in the negative and was then allowed to step out of the box.

The defence then called Mrs. Arthur Wilson, the Tranby Croft hostess and a party-defendant to the suit. Sir Charles Russell bowed courteously to the lady as she entered the witness box and at once proceeded with her examination. Witness testified she distinctly recollected having observed her son looking at her with a puzzled expression from time to time during the progress of the game of baccarat on the night of Sept. 8. Later her son informed her that he had seen the plaintiff, Sir Wm. Gordon Cumming, cheat at play. When her son informed her of the detection by him of Sir William's dishonest play witness said to him, "You must not mention it, we must not have a scandal in our house." Once witness had seen the plaintiff push a £10 counter over the chalk line so openly that she wondered that none of the others observed the action. Witness was then turned over to the prosecuting counsel for cross-examination. She admitted that the Prince of Wales had appealed to her to say nothing of the matter. On the night of the 8th of September the Prince asked her to have a proper baccarat table prepared for use on the following evening. This had occurred before the witness knew anything of the alleged cheating. In reply to a question by Sir Edward Clarke, witness said that her husband had objected to baccarat being played in his house only because he feared that play might become too high among hot headed youths, who were somewhat of her company. When asked why she had not told the Prince that her husband objected to baccarat being played there, she replied: "I did not do so because we were such a staid, non-gambling party, that I did not think much harm could come from the little play indulged in. In response to other questions by plaintiff's counsel witness was forced to admit that she had sat at play on the second night, September 9th, with a guest whom she had heard solemnly denounced as a cheat. Here counsel plied her with question after question, a course that somewhat confused her. At last she was asked point blank, "Why did you, in your own house, and where it was your duty to protect your guests, sit at play with a man whom you heard called a common cheat?"

To the utter amazement of every one present witness replied, "I had put it out of mind. I had a lot of other matters to think about." To say that this episode created a sensation is to put it mildly indeed. Asked whether she had seen Sir William cheat, witness replied, "Yes, unfortunately, without doubt." This concluded the cross-examination of Mrs. Wilson.

How to Use the Mails.

By direction of the Postmaster-General the Chief Post Office Inspector, Mr. Swearman, has lately been making special inquiry into certain cases in which letters and packages of more than ordinary size had been broken or torn in course of post. The chief inspector's investigations lead to the conclusion that, in the great majority of cases, the damage has been the consequence of the inferior coverings (envelopes, paper boxes, etc.) used for the articles in question. He thinks that if